

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/941,863	TAKAGI, TADAO
	Examiner Jonathan Ouellette	Art Unit 3629

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jonathan Ouellette. (3) _____.

(2) Randi Isaacs. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 March 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,3,5,8,10,11,12,14,15,16,17,20,22,23,24,25,28, and 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wallis et al. (US 2001/0051884 A1) and Official Notice.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Isaacs and Examiner Ouellette discussed the outstanding 101 and 112 rejections. Ms. Isaacs further explained how the sited prior fails to teach or disclose the main concepts disclosed in the independent claims of the instant invention, to include: 1) transmitting repair information to the user and receiving repair confirmation from the user, and 2) storing data regarding various types of boxes suitable for different products in a database - and using the database to send servers (shipping co.) correct box information, so the server can then send the correct type/size box to the user for shipping the product to be repaired. The Examiner agreed that Ms. Isaacs arguments were valid, and requested she make the arguments in a formal response, so that the Examiner could give the arguments further consideration after completing a more detailed search/analysis of the sited prior art.